

88

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/938,670	PETERSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID J. ISABELLA	3738	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DAVID J. ISABELLA.

(3) PIERRE KARY.

(2) STANISLAUS AKSMAN.

(4) VICTORIA SILCOTT.

Date of Interview: 2/22/66

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: RUSSIAN PUBLICATION 2127129 AND REISSUE PATENT (38913) TO PAVLYK.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative argued that the hydrogel of the Russian Publication is materially dissimilar to that as claimed. Specifically, the method uses acrylamide to form the hydrogel. The method is run under basic pH and which predominately hydrolyzes the acrylamide to acrylic acid; and the resulting product having less than 1 percent acrylamide. Moreover, it is not clear if the acrylamide is in the form of a polymer of acrylamide. The claim requires the crosslinking of acrylamide with methylene bis-acrylamide and the Russian Publication fails to meet this limitation..